

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed December 28, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Applicants' representatives thanks Examiner Vaughn for the telephone conversation conducted on March 11, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. No agreements were reached.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1-12, 14-18, and 21-28 are pending in the present application. Specifically, claims 16, 17, 23, and 25 are original unamended claims; claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14, 18, 24, and 26-28 were previously presented; claims 13, 19, and 20 are cancelled; and claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 21, and 22 have been currently amended without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1-18 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elmore et al., US Patent Publication 2006/0059107, filed 3/30/2001, published 3/16/2006 (hereinafter Elmore).

Response to the Rejection

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1. Without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 1. It is hereby respectfully submitted that claim 1, at least as currently amended, is allowable over the cited prior art. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found throughout Applicants' application, for example see paragraphs [0008], [0035], [0037], [0038], [0046], and [0048]. Specially,

Elmore neither discloses nor suggests “one or more validation tables including a local validation table and a global validation table” and a “a depth-first traversal order for encountering the plurality of elements” as recited in amended claim 1. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 1.

Claims 2-9

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-9 are allowable for several reasons. For example, currently amended claim 5 cites an exclusive delegate that is not disclosed in the cited prior art. Similarly, currently amended claim 6 cites a specific sequence that is not disclosed in the cited prior art.

Previously presented claim 7 cites a flag that, according to the current Office action, is disclosed in paragraphs 72, 87, and 89 of Elmore. As is known, a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 necessitates that the cited prior art reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention with no question of obviousness being present. However, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraphs 72, 87, and 89 of Elmore do not satisfy this requirement for rejecting claim 7.

Irrespective of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-9 are at least allowable by law due to their dependency on allowable claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection, followed by allowance of claims 2-9.

Claim 10

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 10. Applicants specifically traverse the Office action allegation that the claim is directed toward a method for the computer-readable medium of claim 1 and is “*rejected using the same rationale*.” The scope of each of independent claims 1 and 10 is distinct and different.

Applicants respectfully request unambiguous identification of each prior art element that anticipates Applicants’ individual claim elements in claim 10, as is necessary for carrying out a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Notwithstanding the remarks above, Applicants have opted to currently amend claim 10 in the interests of moving forward prosecution in the case. Amended claim 10 includes “an exclusive delegate” that is not disclosed in the cited prior art. It is hereby respectfully submitted that claim 10, at least as amended, is allowable over the cited prior art.

Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 11-12 and 14-17

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 11-12 and 14-17 are allowable for several reasons including their dependency on allowable claim 10. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 18

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 18. Applicants specifically traverse the Office action allegation that computer-readable media of claim 18 is directed towards the same matter as computer-readable medium claim 1. The scope of each of these two independent claims is distinct and different.

Furthermore, the Office action fails to disclose where in Elmore can be found each element of Applicants' claim 18 as is required by law for carrying out a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. For example, the Office action fails to disclose where in Elmore can be found a part of Applicants' claim 18 that cites: "*a plurality of element names, each element name identifying an element within text content that is structured into a plurality of elements comprised of markup and the content, which is delimited by the markup*" (emphasis added).

The Office action further fails to disclose where in Elmore can be found another part of Applicants' claim 18 that cites: "*for each element name, a flag indicating whether the first delegate corresponding to the element name is to be applied exclusively to the element corresponding to the element name and to any subtree thereof*" (emphasis added). While Elmore may disclose certain flags, a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 necessitates that Elmore specifically disclose a flag that has the specific "exclusive" functionality cited in Applicants' claim 18.

For at least the reasons described above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 18.

Claim 21

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 21 and draw attention to remarks made above with reference to the rejection of claims 10 and 18. In the interests of brevity these remarks will not be repeated herein.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21, at least as currently amended, is allowable over the cited prior art and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claim 21.

Claims 22-25

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 22-25 are allowable for several reasons. Furthermore, these claims are allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 21. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Claim 26

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 26 and draw attention to certain remarks made above with reference to the rejection of claim 18. In the interests of brevity these remarks will not be repeated herein.

The Office action fails to disclose where in Elmore can be found a part of Applicants' claim 26 that cites: *"traversing a structured document to visit elements of the structured document, the elements comprising markup and content that is delimited by the markup, where the markup conforms to a markup language, and where the elements are of various element types,"* (emphasis added).

The Office action further fails to disclose where in Elmore can be found another part of Applicants' claim 26 that cites: *"checking the types of the respective elements when the validation engine visits the elements for validation and using the types to determine which executable validation delegates to execute to validate the contents of the respective elements, where the determining is performed according to mapping information that maps the executable validation delegates to corresponding element types, and where the mapping information can be modified to cause the same validation engine, without modification, to modify which executable validation delegates the validation engine selects for which corresponding element types"* (emphasis added).

While Elmore may disclose a connection with external systems, there is no explicit or implicit disclosure to indicate that such a connection allows "mapping information to be modified" wherein Applicants' *mapping information* is defined as *maps the executable validation delegates to corresponding element types*. Elmore's "credit card validation, address validation and service reservation" elements bear no relevance to Applicants'

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1956/303857.1
Application No.: 10/643,031
Office Action Dated: December 28, 2007

PATENT

“mapping information” as defined in claim 26.

For at least the reasons described above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable over the cited prior art and hereby request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 27-28

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 27 and 28 are allowable for several reasons. Furthermore, these claims are allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 26. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of these claims.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1956/303857.1
Application No.: 10/643,031
Office Action Dated: December 28, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-12, 14-18, and 21-28 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative.

Date: March 26, 2008

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439